☐ SECRET ☒ CONFIDENTIAL ☐ UNCLASSIFIED 25X1

CONTRACT INSPECTION REPORT

CONTRACT NO. | TASK NO. 25X1

TO:

DATE: 9 May 1969

INSPECTION REPORT NO. *(If final, so state)*: 20

ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE

NAME OF CONTRACTOR 25X1

TYPE OF COMMODITY OR SERVICE: Film Processor 25X1

THE CONTRACTOR IS ON SCHEDULE ☐ YES ☒ NO

PER CENT OF WORK COMPLETED - 100%

PER CENT OF FUNDS EXPENDED - 100%

THE CONTRACTOR WILL PROBABLY REMAIN WITHIN ALLOCATED FUNDS ☒ YES ☐ NO IF ANSWER IS "NO" ADVISE RECOMMENDATION AND/OR ACTION OF SPONSORING OFFICE, ON REVERSE HEREOF. IF KNOWN, INDICATE MAGNITUDE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS INVOLVED.

HAS AN INTERIM REPORT, FINAL REPORT, PROTOTYPE, OR OTHER END ITEM BEEN RECEIVED FROM THE CONTRACTOR DURING THE PERIOD? ☐ YES ☒ NO *(If yes, give details on reverse side.)*

HAS GOVERNMENT-OWNED PROPERTY BEEN DELIVERED TO CONTRACTOR DURING THIS PERIOD? ☐ YES ☒ NO *(If yes, indicate items, quantity, and cost on reverse side.)*

INCENTIVES

IS THIS AN INCENTIVE CONTRACT ☐ YES ☒ NO

IF YES, CHECK TYPE ☐ COST ☐ AWARD FEE ☐ PERFORMANCE ☐ DELIVERY

NOTE:
USE REVERSE SIDE FOR COMMENTS.
FINAL REPORT MUST CONTAIN INCENTIVE EVALUATION.

OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF CONTRACTOR

1. ☐ OUTSTANDING
2. ☐ EXCELLENT
3. ☐ VERY GOOD
4. ☐ ABOVE AVERAGE
5. ☐ AVERAGE
6. ☐ MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE
7. ☒ UNSATISFACTORY

IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF CONTRACTOR IS UNSATISFACTORY OR MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE INDICATE REASONS ON REVERSE SIDE.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

☐ CONTINUE AS PROGRAMMED

☐ WITHHOLD PAYMENT PENDING SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE

☒ CLOSE OUT - See Reverse

☐ OTHER *(Specify)*

Declass Review by NIMA/DOD

IF THIS IS A FINAL REPORT PUT COMMENTS ON REVERSE IN NARRATIVE FORM ON CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE AND CERTIFY THAT ALL DELIVERABLE ITEMS UNDER THE CONTRACT HAVE BEEN RECEIVED. THESE INCLUDE, WHERE APPLICABLE, THE FOLLOWING:

ITEM	REC'D	DOES NOT APPLY	ITEM	REC'D	DOES NOT APPLY
PROTOTYPES			MANUALS		
DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS			FINAL REPORT		
PRODUCTION AND/OR OTHER END ITEMS			SPECIAL TOOLING		
			OTHER GOVERNMENT PROPERTY		

DATE OF LAST CONTACT WITH CONTRACTOR: 11 April 1969

25X1

25X1

FORM 12-67 1897 USE PREVIOUS EDITION ☐ UNCLASSIFIED ☐ CONFIDENTIAL ☐ SECRET (12-36)

NARRATIVE REPORT ☐ INTERIM ☐ FINAL

A second pre-acceptance test visit was made to the Contractor's plant on 7-11 April 1969. Test results were very discouraging in that the processor did not meet the design goals in many respects.

The original intent of this system was to process both original negatives and duplicate positive stock in a straight through path using air and liquid as the carrying medium. This approach appeared feasible from the tests performed of a breadboard model of the system. However, the follow-on prototype has been plagued by numerous design deficiencies such as the originally proposed infra-red drying system which had to be replaced with a modified HTA drier which is a serpentine system--thus defeating the straight through processing cycle; the glycerine and water tank heaters had to be replaced with conventional in-tank heaters; the forced air system had to be completely revamped, etc.

At the conclusion of our present testing which included transport speeds, tracking, drying, carry-over, instrumentation, scratch tests, uniformity, sensitometric tests, and temperature control, it was decided that the processor simply could not meet the established parameters. Film [redacted] would not dry; film [redacted] showed considerable mottling; [redacted] due to the thin base, would not track properly; the machine needs the constant attention of two operators; the replenishment rates are extremely high and it is very doubtful if the present design can ever be made to operate properly. 25X1 25X1 25X1

Due to the numerous deficiencies encountered, it was decided to go no further with the development and the Contractor was advised to ship the equipment into [redacted] hold until a recipient can be found or until salvage action is initiated. A final report will be submitted upon receipt of the equipment and manuals [redacted] 25X1 25X1